

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS FO Box 1430 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.tepto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/029,769	10/19/2001	Karen E. Riley	10022/178	4749	
28164 ACCENTURE	7590 06/26/2908 CCHICAGO 28164	3	EXAMINER NGUYEN, TAN D		
	ER GILSON & LIONE				
P O BOX 1039 CHICAGO, II			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			3689		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			06/26/2008	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Ī	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/029,769	RILEY ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Tan Dean D. Nguyen	3689	

The MAIL INC DATE of this communication appears on the course short with the correspondence address
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address
THE REPLY FILED 30 April 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.
 The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replices: (1) an amendment, afficiarty, or other evidence, which places the application, applicant must timely file one of the following repeat feet in application and the properties of the properti
application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:
 a) Metal The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee
Laterboxin of the later by Qualitative Under 3 of NT 1.7040; in the care without help reason that of 3 of NT 1.7040; and are applying the Assession tend have been filled its the data for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the file. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CPR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any semed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL.
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of
2. If the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(a)), to any dismissal of the appeal. Since Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).
<u>AMENDMENTS</u>
 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims. NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. ☐ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:
Claim(s) objected to:
Claim(s) rejected: 1-8.10 and 12-67.
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a
showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached. REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER
11. 🖾 The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s), (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s).
13. Other:
/Tan Dean D. Nguyen/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3689

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: 1) Applicant's comment that the combined references fall to teach the step of "calculating a priority value for the request in accordance with the type of regress and impact of the request is not persuasive since these are inherently included in the teachings of Mangipud et al Figs. 2, 4 and 7, and cols. 1, lines 22-30, which describes business performance as "insision critical condition" and the impact of poor business performance (web service) as "loss in services into distinct levels or groups to reflect the importance of the business performance level. The four parameters listed basically refer to the "impact" of the service since the intervent of the service, i.e. doing commerce or business on the web, and the loss of the business by the client if the client "Web site/operation" is not properly maintained by a service provider or host. As shown in Fig. 7, which uses the "Adaptive Policy Engine" to classify the user's request into different classes, i.e. "gold", "sliver", and "bronze", this reads over the step of "determining a value" and "classifying" a claimed. Moreover, On page 34-25 of the sprictication, applicant indicates that these are generic terms and the meaning of each term will be adjusted to fit the organization. Moreover they are determined adaptance to present services and appear to be relative since "...measuring the value of each metric should not take more than a severotly or a Service Desk Operator,", see page 24, lines 10-13. Moreover, the use of similar "terms" to "impact" such as "severity", "criticality", and "urgency" would have been obvious as mere using other similar terms for "impact" such as "severity", "criticality", and "urgency"